

Attachment B

MOSCOW, PEKING, HANOI, AND HAVANA PROPAGANDA  
ON REVOLUTIONARY PROTEST MOVEMENTS  
IN THE UNITED STATES

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	
Soviet Union	1 - 5
Communist China	6 - 7
North Vietnam	8 - 9
Cuba	10 - 12

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MOSCOW, PEKING, HANOI, AND HAVANA PROPAGANDA  
ON REVOLUTIONARY PROTEST MOVEMENTS  
IN THE UNITED STATES

Introduction

The official radio and press media of Communist countries are cautious and for the most part unspecific in their treatment of radical protest movements in the United States. Shunning direct statements of support, they convey their view of such movements as a rule in reportorial coverage of events deemed exploitable in the framework of each Communist regime's approach to revolutionary strategy and relations with the United States.

This report will focus on the propaganda of Moscow, Peking, Hanoi, and Havana, the most relevant of the media sources for this study on revolutionary protest movements in the United States.

Selected examples of documentary FBI coverage of this propaganda are assembled by country as an appendix to this attachment.

OPTIONAL FORM  
G-7 (Rev. 1-64)

The Soviet Union

Soviet propaganda in the future will probably be guided primarily by the 17 June 1969 declaration of the conference of Communist parties. The declaration sets forth the U. S. as the main enemy, and views favorably the opposition of radical U. S. youth and students to the Vietnam war, the draft, racism, and "monopoly control of universities." It expresses strong support for "the struggle of the Negro population of the U. S. for their rights." It urges Communist parties to devote considerable attention to work among students. The CPUSA has enthusiastically endorsed this line. Until the fall of 1968 when the Soviets tried to formulate a more positive approach to the youth movement, Soviet propaganda sought to explain all U. S. protest and unrest in classical Communist terms, and avoided giving publicity to extremist groups. The Soviets were noticeably concerned over the threat of contagion from undisciplined Western youth movements and over the disruptive impact of such groups on orthodox Communist parties.

Hitherto, the Soviets have had a shifting and ambivalent attitude toward all student protest activities in the West, including the United States.

On the one hand, commentators have applauded student protest activity as proof of the weaknesses and contradictions of capitalist society and as a natural prelude to the general revolution which will destroy that society. On the other hand, they have decried the youths' disregard of Soviet interests and direction and have warned that the young will be really effective only when they submit to the discipline of the workers' movement and the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

Soviet discussion of foreign youth tends to lump United States and Western European youth together as motivated by similar concerns and influenced by similar ideologies. Thus, the philosopher Herbert Marcuse, conveniently of German birth and American residence, is seen as the spiritual father of the New Left in both the U. S. and Western Europe.

The student role in large-scale disturbances in Europe in early 1968, especially in the events of May in Paris, forced the

issue in Moscow of what policy to adopt toward the movement beyond the general sympathy that had always been expressed on the subject of the alienation of youth in the West. The response came in the form of an article in Pravda in May 1968 by commentator Yury Zhukov, who gave a detailed critique of Marcuse's theories and castigated his young followers, including Cohn-Bendit, as "werewolves." Foreign policy considerations, especially the interests of the French Communist party, seem to have largely determined this negative reaction.

Soviet officials, however, were clearly surprised and troubled by the effectiveness of the student revolt and the prospect that it would usurp the revolutionary role in the West from the Communist parties. The Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, A. M. Rumyantsev, admitted in September 1968 that "the latest events in France . . . proved to be a surprise in many ways for the Soviet scientific workers." A professor wrote in the Soviet press in November 1968 that "many Communist parties admit they underestimated the potentialities of the student movement."

Since the fall of 1968 press articles have tried to formulate a more positive approach to the youth movements of the West. They developed many of the themes expressed by the physicist Petr Kapitsa to the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences in February 1969 and by Brezhnev in June 1969. While still condemning Marcuse's theories and the anarchistic elements of the students' activities, commentators have seen the "ideological fog in students' heads" as natural and understandable. More important in the commentators' eyes was youth's rejection of capitalist society. Like Kapitsa and Brezhnev, they found that ideological and spiritual disaffection were more important causes of student protest than material conditions. The commentators still maintained, however, that the potential of the young activists could only be realized when they accepted the guidance of the workers' movement and Marxist-Leninist teachings, thereby implying the current independence of the students from Soviet influence.

A Radio Moscow broadcast beamed to Yugoslavia on 23 June 1969 assailed Marcuse and his concept that youth, not the workers, are the motive force of revolution. In a rare Soviet mention of the SDS, it noted that "some" members of this organization have expressed dissatisfaction with Marcuse's view and favor

an alliance with the working class--"a more mighty revolutionary force in capitalist society."

Kapitsa's departure from other writers on the subject is his explicit criticism of Soviet ideologists for their isolation from foreign revolutionary movements and the suggestion that they could fall behind progressive thought in the West. Here Kapitsa is expressing the fears of liberals in the Soviet Union that the dogmatic stance of the present regime is isolating their country from progressive movements in the rest of the world. A similar spirit marks the essay by Kapitsa's fellow physicist Andrey Sakharov, which appeared in the West in July 1968.

The difficulty for the regime is that the attempt to reconcile the student movement in the U.S. and Soviet ideology may lead to modification of the latter. An example is found in an article in the February 1969 issue of the Soviet journal, World Economy and International Relations, which takes the most positive approach yet to youthful revolutionaries in the West. While it speaks of the necessity of their joining ranks with the workers' movement, it notes that the spiritual issues the students are raising are drawing the workers away from their narrow economic concern and are helping to create the "socio-psychological prerequisites" for the revolutionary struggle. This attribution of an almost leading role to the students remains an isolated one, however, and Brezhnev's pronouncement stands as the official analysis.

Leonid Brezhnev's speech to the International Communist conference on 7 June 1969 offers an authoritative statement on the subject. The rising generation in the capitalist countries is in "revolutionary ferment," Brezhnev declared in explaining the "considerable attention" Communist parties are now devoting to work with the young people. He saw the young aroused by opposition to "imperialist wars," and "the militarization of bourgeois society." The negative aspects of the activities of the young, according to Brezhnev, are their spontaneity and "immature forms" and at times their exploitation by anti-Communist elements and "imperialist agents." Nevertheless, he predicted that the young activists, once they have mastered the theory of scientific socialism and gained more experience, "will do great things."

The main document approved by the conference of Communist parties on 17 June 1969 incorporated favorable descriptions of the actions of young American radical elements in its description of the many forces round the world engaged in what the Communists call the struggle against imperialism. The presentation is designed first of all to serve as proof of a basic premise of the conference, that the United States Government is the main enemy of all anti-imperialist forces at home as well as throughout the world, and the universal aggressor against which all forms of struggle should be employed:

"Moreover, the depth of the crisis in the capitalist world is also strikingly revealed by the advance of the mass struggle in the United States itself, that main pillar of world imperialism. A wave of rebellions against racial discrimination, poverty, starvation and police brutality has swept the Negro ghettos . . . .

"Young people, students in particular, black and white, resolutely use various means to oppose the Vietnam war, military conscription, racism, and monopoly control of universities. Reaction replies to this with the assassination of public figures, mounting repression and massive violence."

In the third section of the document, which summarizes the "calls to action" approved by the participating Communist parties, the conference calls, as a part of the general anti-imperialist struggle, for solidarity and support, through protest movements around the world, against

". . . the most ignominious phenomena of our time, the barbarous persecution of the 25 million Negroes in the USA. . . ."

The so-called "Peace Appeal," unanimously approved by the participating parties at the June Moscow conference equates anti-war manifestations in the United States with the armed attack on our forces in Vietnam, as laudable parts of the kind of "struggle for peace" supported and carried out by all Communist parties:

"The struggle for peace comprises both the victorious battles fought by the Vietnamese patriots in the jungles of South Vietnam and the anti-war manifestations in Europe and America. The cause of peace is also served by the actions of the working class against . . . monopolies, by . . . Latin American peoples. . . . by anticolonial movements in . . . Asia and Africa, by the struggle of the Negro population of the United States for their rights. . . ."

The Soviet view of these forces in the United States was well expressed at the June conference by L. I. Brezhnev, speaking in the name of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

"Comrades, one of the decisive sectors of the anti-imperialist struggle naturally runs through the capitalist countries themselves. The blows which the revolutionary forces are dealing imperialism in its very citadels are highly important for the whole of the world development. The 1960's have introduced many new elements in this front of struggle as well.

". . . explosions are becoming ever more frequent everywhere, including the United States, where the most acute social contradictions, the struggle against the war in Vietnam and the fight for Negro civil rights are tangled in a tight knot. It is a long time since imperialism has been confronted with such violent forms of social protest and with general democratic action of the present scale and pitch. . . .

"It is natural that the fraternal parties now devote considerable attention to work among the young people. It is a fact after all that the rising generation in the capitalist countries, including the students, is in revolutionary ferment. Young people are actively coming out in opposition to imperialist wars, to the militarization of bourgeois society, and to the attempts of the bourgeoisie to curtail the working people's democratic rights."

Communist China

Revolution or people's war in any country is the business of the masses in that country and should be carried out primarily by their own efforts; there is no other way.

-- Lin Piao, "Long Live the Victory  
of People's War,"  
2 September 1965

Through the broadcasts of Radio Peking in English and the distribution in the United States of the Peking Review and other English-language publications, Communist China has provided a measure of propaganda support and ideological guidance to U.S. radical movements. Peking does not, however, specifically tailor this propaganda for a U.S. audience-- it is part of a monolithic effort targeted at audiences worldwide. The propaganda is couched in doctrinaire terms, concerned generally with student, youth, and black radicals. Attention to anti-Vietnam war activities, as to all aspects of the war, is slight. The ideological guidance, for those disposed to pay heed, is made available through the publication and rebroadcasting in English of Mao's "works," and through the innumerable rehashes of his "thought."

Peking's exploitation of American student unrest, however, indicates that the Chinese view the subject as a target of opportunity through which they can discredit the U.S. image world-wide. Their propaganda portrays student activities as an example of the "unending troubles which have brought the U.S. to the verge of collapse" and "progressive forces struggling against the capitalist system." Lin Piao has stated that, "We firmly support the proletariat, the students and youth and masses of the Black People of the United States in their just struggle against the U.S. ruling clique."

Chinese Communist propaganda seldom refers to individual U.S. groups, the single notable exception being the Maoist-oriented Progressive Labor Party, several articles and statements of which have been publicized by NCNA this year. Apart from the

6  
CONFIDENTIAL

general objective of simply blackening the U.S., the fact that some of these students are self-styled "Maoists" probably increases Peking's incentive to lend verbal support to such "progressive elements."

Particular attention has been paid to the militant Black movement. In a very widely publicized statement on 16 April 1968, "in support of the Afro-American struggle against violence," Mao Tse-tung declared that the assassination of Dr. King, "an exponent of nonviolence," has taught U.S. Blacks "a profound lesson." The nature of the "lesson" was not spelled out by Mao. But lesser, routine Chinese commentators expounded the view that Dr. King's death established the bankruptcy of his philosophy of nonviolence and showed the Black masses and all "American revolutionary people" that they must meet "counterrevolutionary violence with revolutionary violence."

During the U.S. civil disorders in the summer of 1967, a series of People's Daily articles had applauded statements by militant Black spokesmen and branded Dr. King a "reactionary lackey" who preaches "the humbug of nonviolence." People's Daily predicted that the "Afro-American masses" together with "oppressed strata" of the white population will isolate and besiege the "handful of reactionaries who rule the country."

The April 1968 statement by Mao, along with his previous formal statement on U.S. racial discrimination on 8 August 1968, constitute the core of Peking's propaganda on the "Afro-American struggle." The anniversaries of their issuance are observed through renewed publicity for the original statements, coupled with elucidations and updating of the textual content. The anniversary propaganda since 1968 has stressed the thesis that the Afro-Americans' "main form of struggle" currently is "armed struggle against police violence." At the same time, Peking has expressed its aversion to separatist trends, repeatedly stressing a community of interests between Black and White workers in opposition to the capitalist system.

North Vietnam

Vietnamese Communist media emphasize anti-war attitudes among the American people and frequently quote anti-war statements by members of Congress and other prominent U.S. personalities, but have given relatively little publicity to anti-war demonstrations. During 1967 and 1968, Hanoi and Liberation Front media publicized South and North Vietnamese "people's committees" for solidarity with "progressive" American groups and individuals and aired messages of greetings both to "the American people" and to specific U.S. groups. The only message of this kind during 1969, however, has been an appeal to the SDS from the "South Vietnam Liberation Students' Union" in March for support in the campaign for the nullification of sentences meted out to Buddhists. Normally Hanoi ignores SDS activities and student unrest. Both Hanoi and Liberation Front media tend to lump all protest elements in a single category, the "progressive people" of the United States, appealing to them for continued support and crediting them, along with the peoples of socialist countries, with contributing to victories in Vietnam.

In October 1967 the establishment of a "South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity with the American People" (CSAP) was announced. Its counterpart in the North was founded almost a year later. A communique on the formation of the CSAP said its objectives were to promote friendship and to "unite and coordinate with the American people in the struggle for peace, justice, freedom, democracy, and civil rights, and in demanding that the U.S. Government put an end to its aggressive war in Vietnam." One of the committee's tasks was said to be the establishment of contact with all "progressive" organizations and individuals in the "American people's struggle."

On 15 November 1967 the CSAP addressed a letter to American soldiers in South Vietnam which urged them to refuse to fight and stated that the committee would help any serviceman find his way home or to any other place. The letter noted that the committee had chapters in South Vietnamese cities. In September 1968 the CSAP sent a letter to the National Mobilization Committee extending thanks to "progressive" American people for their activities at the Chicago Democratic convention.

A CSAP letter to the American people on its first anniversary in 1968 referred to "friendly ties and close solidarity" between the two peoples in the common struggle for peace, justice, freedom, democracy, and civil rights and an end to the war in Vietnam. It cited conferences held to promote this goal in Bratislava, Paris, Stockholm, Sofia, Budapest, "and so forth." The letter extended greetings and gratitude to anti-war organizations of Americans living in France, Great Britain, and Cuba and to various peace organizations around the world who were aiding American draft resisters and deserters.

The counterpart committee in North Vietnam (DRV) was formulated on 10 July 1968 with Professor Hoang Minh Giang, the DRV Minister of Culture, as its president. While the statement on the formation of the committee accentuated the building of friendship as its goal and made no mention of coordination in anti-war activities, Giang referred at the formation ceremony to "coordinating struggles and supporting each other."

There are also infrequent expressions of support for the "struggles" of the American Black people. On 17 August 1968, for example, the Vietnam Asia-Africa Solidarity Committee held a meeting marking the "day of international solidarity with the Afro-American people."

DRV Premier Pham Van Dong, in an interview granted the Mexican publication Siglo Veintiuno on 30 March 1968, was asked for his views on U. S. recruitment of citizens of Mexican descent, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes for the war in Vietnam. He replied that it was lamentable that they were forced to fight in Vietnam and added: "The NLF is seeking a way to make those people understand the essence of this struggle and the just stand that should be adopted."

Cuba

Cuban media have from time to time publicized statements and articles by members of the Black Panthers, SDS, and such organizations as SNCC, although there has been a marked abatement of such propaganda in the past six months, because of preoccupation with domestic issues. While emphasizing the theme of anti-war sentiment among the American people and in Congress, Havana does not as a rule discuss the role of specific groups or movements in opposition to the war.

Cuban radio broadcasts avoid detailed accounts of student activities, but emphasize that manifestations of discontent and rebellion by U.S. youths are symptomatic of the "sickness" of U.S. life and institutions. Havana publishes various propaganda materials aimed at influencing U.S. and other youths. The emphasis is on Vietnam, Che Guevara and his idyllic quest for revolutionary endeavors, and is generally aimed at undermining U.S. foreign policy.

In the only available commentary which has broached the question of Cuban influence over U.S. radical movements in recent months, a 2 April 1969 Radio Havana talk set out to rebut a statement by Congressman Henry Gonzalez to the effect that the Mexican-American community had been infiltrated by California youth of Mexican ancestry who had traveled to Cuba on trips subsidized by the Havana regime. The commentator charged that the congressman was trying to make Cuba the scapegoat for "problems rooted in the expansionist policy of the United States during the 19th Century and in the present living conditions of Mexican-Americans, Latin Americans, and Negroes." The commentator argued that U.S. young people do not have to leave their country to learn violent tactics, since "violence is a characteristic of North American society," but concluded fatuously that Cuba was "honored" by the accusation that it is "an example and stimulus to those fighting the injustices of the imperialist system of exploitation." The commentator added that "Cuba offers her own example and stretches her friendly and firm hand to those fighting for a better tomorrow."

In past comment eulogizing Che Guevara, the ubiquitous influence of his "example" has been emphasized in general terms.

Last October, marking the first anniversary of Guevara's death, Havana media cited his impact as a "political catalyst" in much of the world, specifically including the United States, and boasted that "never in history have the revolutionary concepts of a leader of oppressed peoples spread so widely and so rapidly."

Statements by spokesmen for the Black Panthers and SNCC carried in Havana media have lauded Che Guevara and his teachings. Thus Prensa Latina on 15 February 1969 reported an interview with two Black Panther leaders which appeared in Tricontinental, organ of the Havana-based Afro-Asian Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AALAPSO), in which they acknowledged the inspirational influence of the Cuban revolution and stated: "We are happy to see that oppressed peoples are following the brave example of Che Guevara to create one, two, three, many Vietnams, and we will work together for the destruction of imperialism." In October 1968, Radio Havana reported that a SNCC official visiting Havana had said Guevara's teachings were deeply rooted among Black Americans. He was also quoted as predicting that guerrilla warfare would "increasingly become the method of common struggle" both in the United States and in "liberation struggles" world-wide.

Emphasis on SNCC, and particularly its leader Stokely Carmichael, shifted during the past year to the Black Panthers. In a Havana press conference in August 1968 a Black Panther leader was quoted in Cuban media as alleging that the direction the struggle was taking in the United States is that of resistance through guerrilla warfare.

While Havana media gave extensive coverage to Carmichael's visit to Havana in the summer of 1967 to attend the Latin American Solidarity Organization conference, where he participated as "an honorary delegate," he has received scant mention for more than a year. Carmichael was interviewed by telephone by Radio Havana in April 1968 after the assassination of Martin Luther King and was quoted as forecasting that "urban guerrilla warfare" would develop in U.S. cities; with Dr. King's passing, he said, "there is no Black man who will ask Black people not to burn down cities."

Since Havana's "Radio Free Dixie" broadcasts to the United States featuring U.S. Negro expatriate Robert Williams went off the air in March 1966 (Williams migrated to Peking), Havana has not addressed inflammatory appeals for violence directly to U.S. Negroes. But Cuban comment has on occasion continued to argue that violence may be the sole method for the U.S. Negro to better his lot. Thus, after the slaying of Dr. King, Havana comment stressed that with the murder "imperialism has buried its last hope for a nonviolent solution to its racial problems."

Cuban media have yet to acknowledge reports that Black Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver is in Havana, nor have they taken cognizance of allegations that Black Panthers may have been involved in the diversions of U.S. airliners to Havana.